| / CCIOII ICCIII = 0 | Action | Item | 16 |
|---------------------|--------|------|----|
|---------------------|--------|------|----|

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION DIRECTIVE

| ADMINISTRATIVE MATTER | | DATE | July 11, 2019 |
|-----------------------|----------|------------|---------------|
| MOTOR CARRIER MATTER | | DOCKET NO. | 2019-213-E |
| UTILITIES MATTER | ✓ | ORDER NO. | 2019-504 |

THIS DIRECTIVE SHALL SERVE AS THE COMMISSION'S ORDER ON THIS ISSUE.

SUBJECT:

<u>DOCKET NO. 2019-213-E</u> - <u>Hector and Jerdene Rivaz, Complainant/Petitioner v Dominion Energy South Carolina, Incorporated, Defendant/Respondent</u> - Staff Presents for Commission Consideration Dominion Energy South Carolina, Incorporated's Motion to Dismiss.

COMMISSION ACTION:

This consumer complaint against Dominion Energy concerns a residential account which was subject to a budget billing agreement the customer entered into with the utility. The complaint disputes a change in the amount of a budget billing payment and the balance due under the budget billing program. As to the nature of the complaint, the complainants checked boxes on the complaint form indicating (1) Billing Error/Adjustments; (2) Wrong Rate; and (3) Meter Issue.

In response to the Complaint, Dominion filed a letter setting forth its answer/response and its Motion to Dismiss; various billing records on the account; the affidavit of Cindi Hux, Supervisor for Customer Service-Quality Assurance, who verified the contents of Dominion's response and Motion to Dismiss; and the findings letter from the Office of Regulatory Staff after a meter test was conducted and ORS completed its investigation of the complaint.

In its response, Dominion explains the Budget Billing payment amount stating to determine a customer's monthly Budget Billing payment amount, Dominion averages the customer's 12 previous bills and the projected cost of energy over the next 12 months and divides that amount into 12 equal payments. Changes to the monthly budget billing amount may be made during the year if rate changes occur, if the customer adds additional services to his or her account, or if the customer's actual usage changes significantly. An annual adjustment is scheduled after the customer has received 12 monthly bills. At that time, a customer's budget billing amount is recalculated based on the actual energy charges over the previous 12 months and the projected cost of energy over the next 12 months. The customer's payments and charges are then reconciled. If the total of the customer's payments are not enough to cover his or her actual charges for the previous year, the customer is given the option to either pay the difference from the previous year in full, or pay the new Budget Billing amount which will include the amount brought forward from the previous year as part of the new monthly payment amount.

Dominion states it notified the complainant on December 18, 2018, that a periodic review of the account indicated the need to change the monthly Budget Billing amount in an attempt to prevent a large balance on their budget billing anniversary date. At the time the adjustment was made, the account balance was under-collected and the adjustment would be added to the monthly budget billing payment to recover the under-collected balance. Dominion also provided the findings letter from the Office of Regulatory Staff of ORS' review of the complaint. That findings letter contained documentation from the meter test conducted and indicated the meter tested within normal regulatory limits and working properly.

Following review of the complaint and the response of Dominion, including the affidavit of Ms. Hux, the account billing records, and the findings letter from ORS, it appears from the meter test that the electric

meter was functioning within the limits of accuracy prescribed by the Commission's regulations and that Dominion's charges were accurate and made in accordance with the Budget Billing program. Nothing presented by the complainant indicates a billing error, an incorrect rate being charged, or a meter issue.

I therefore conclude that the Complaint alleges no violation of a Commission regulation or statute and move that the Complaint be dismissed.

| PRESIDING | : <u>Randall</u> | | | | SESSION: R | <u>egular</u> | | TIME: | 2:00 բ | o.m. |
|-----------|------------------|----------|----|-------|------------|---------------|------|----------------|--------|---------------|
| | MOTION | YES | NO | OTHER | | | | | | |
| BELSER | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | | | |
| ERVIN | | ✓ | | | | | | | | |
| HAMILTON | | ✓ | | | | | | | | |
| HOWARD | | ✓ | | | | | | | | |
| RANDALL | | ✓ | | | | | | | | |
| WHITFIELD | | ✓ | | | | | | | | |
| WILLIAMS | | ✓ | | | | | | | | |
| (SEAL) |) | | | | | REC | ORDE | D ВҮ: <u>J</u> | . Schm | <u>ieding</u> |

